REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 61-66 are currently being amended, whereby the amendments made to these claims are clarifying in nature and are not believed to affect the scope of these claims.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-66 are now pending in this application.

Request for Entry of Amendment and Reply:

It is respectfully requested that this after-final amendment and reply be considered and entered, since: a) it is believed to place this application in condition for allowance without requiring further consideration and/or search, and b) it lessens the number of potential issues for appeal.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicant appreciates the indication in the Office Action that claims 1-60 are allowed.

Claim Rejections:

In the Office Action, claims 61-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,745,169 to Murphy; and claims 61-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,654,500 to Lyu. These rejections are traversed with respect to presently pending claims 61-66, for at least the reasons given below.

As explained on page 27, lines 27-30 of the specification, in the present invention according to claims 61-63, an invalid block judgment process is limited to the blocks in which errors might have occurred, that is, blocks which were contained in the packets in which errors have been detected by the error detection section. Thus, an error detection section first detects whether or not a packet (and thus the coded block data units making up the packet) has an error in it. If there is an error in the packet, then each of the coded block data units making up the "error-detected packet", after being decoded into decoded block data units, are checked to determine if any of those decoded block data units have been decoded normally or not. If any of those decoded block data units of the "error-detected packet" have not been decoded normally, then an error concealing operation is performed on those improperly decoded block data units (of the error-detected packet").

Claims 61-63 have been amended to specifically clarify that the judging means/judging step judges whether each of the plurality of decoded block data units to which the error portion corresponds is decoded normally or not. Thus, the decoded block data units of packets having no error (as determined by an error detection section, for example) are not subject to error concealing, whereby only the decoded block data units of packets having an error (as determined by an error detection section) are checked to see if those block data units are decoded normally or not, and if not decoded normally, then those block data units are subject to an error concealing process. Claims 64-66 have been amended in a similar manner.

Neither Murphy nor Lyu teaches or suggests the above-mentioned features of presently pending claims 61-66. In Murphy, received video data is broken up into frames, and each frame is decoded and checked with other frames in order to determine if an error concealing operation should be performed. Murphy's system is unlike that of the invention according to claims 61-63, in which each of a plurality of decoded block data units to which an error portion corresponds (as determined by an error detection unit/step) are judged to see whether or not those decoded block data units are decoded normally or not.

Thus, in the present invention according to claims 61-63, only the decoded block data units of the packets (and their corresponding block data units) that have an error portion in their coded signal (as determined by an error detection unit or step) are judged to see whether or not their decoded block data units are decoded normally or not. Murphy, on the other hand, checks all of his decoded block data units to determine whether or not to perform an error concealing operation, which provides for the possibility of wasteful concealing processing, similar to the conventional video decoding device of Figure 2 of the drawings (as described on page 28, lines 3-12 of the specification).

Furthermore, Murphy's system is different from the invention as recited in presently pending claims 64-66, for at least the same reasons given above.

Lyu also does not disclose or suggest the invention according to claims 61-66. In Lyu, a DEMUX 11 inserts an error code into a demultiplexed bit stream which allows a unique decoding (see column 3, lines 20-22 of Lyu). If an error code is detected from the video bit stream in the course of normal decoding, a video decoder stops decoding the video bit streams output from a video buffer and searches for a code indicating the capability of performing normal decoding, whereby that code indicating the capability of performing normal decoding is inserted into a location of a sequence from which the decoding may be performed. When the code indicating a capability of normal decoding is detected, the video decoder continues the normal decoding. See column 4, lines 38-49 of Lyu. This is clearly different than what is recited in claims 61-63, whereby a judging means/judging step judges whether each of the plurality of decoded block data units to which the error portion corresponds is decoded normally or not. In particular, Lyu checks to see if an error code is detected from a video bit stream in the course of normal decoding, as described in column 4, lines 39-40 of Lyu.

Also, the teachings of Lyu are different from the invention as recited in claims 64-66, for at least the same reasons given above.

Therefore, presently pending claims 61-66 are not anticipated by either Murphy or by Lyu.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 17, 2004

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399